arXiv:1610.02737v1 [math.MG] 9 Oct 2016

On the dimensions of faces of compact convex sets

Vera Roshchina*, Tian Sang* and David Yost†

October 11, 2016

Abstract

Whilst faces of a polytope form a well structured lattice, in which faces of each possible dimension are present, the latter property is not true for general compact convex sets. We address the question of which dimensional patterns are possible for the faces of general closed convex sets. We show that for any finite sequence of positive integers there exist compact convex sets which only have extreme points and faces with dimensions from this prescribed sequence. We also discuss another approach to dimensionality, considering the dimension of the union of all faces of the same dimension. We show that the questions arising from this approach are highly nontrivial and give examples of convex sets for which the sets of extreme points have fractal dimension.

1 Introduction

It is well known that faces of polyhedral sets have a well-defined structure (see [7]). In particular, every face of a polyhedral set is a polyhedron, and there are no 'gaps' in the dimensions of the faces. A natural question is then, what are the possible patterns for the dimensions of faces of compact convex sets? We know that even well structured convex sets, such as the cone of positive semidefinite matrices, may have large gaps in the dimensions of their faces, for instance, the cone $\mathbb{S}^n_+$ of positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices has faces of dimensions k^2 for $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ (see [5] for detailed discussion).

Recall that a *face* F of a closed convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex subset of C such that for any point $x \in F$ and for any line segment $[a, b] \subset C$ such that $x \in (a, b)$, we have $a, b \in F$. The fact that F is a face of C is expressed as $F \lhd C$.

The difference between this definition and the definition of faces of polyhedral sets as intersections with supporting hyperplanes is due to the fact that for nonpolyhedral convex sets faces are not necessarily *exposed*: it may happen that a face can not be represented as the intersection of a supporting hyperplane with the set. Some classic examples are shown in Figs. 1 (see [3]) and 2 (see [2]).

The dimension of a convex set is the dimension of its affine hull, same for the face. We refer the reader to the classic textbooks [1, 3].

*School of Science, RMIT University

†Centre for Informatics and Applied Optimisation, Federation University Australia



Figure 1: Convex hull of a torus is not facially exposed (the dashed line shows the unexposed extreme points).



Figure 2: An example of a two dimensional set and a three dimensional cone that have an unexposed face.

The total number of possible face patterns in n dimensional space is the cardinality of the powerset of n elements. This is because every set contains zero-dimensional faces (because of the Krein-Milman theorem). We can write down face patterns either as an increasing sequence of positive numbers $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k)$, which encode all possible dimensions of faces of positive dimension present in a set, or as a binary sequence $(b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)$, where $b_i = 1$ if a face of dimension i is present in the set, and $b_i = 0$ otherwise. For example, the dimensional pattern of a tetrahedron is either $(1, 2, 3)$ in the d-notation or $(1, 1, 1)$ in the binary notation, and the pattern of a closed Euclidean ball is either (n) or $(0, 0, \ldots, 1)$, as it does not have any faces except for zero- and n-dimensional ones. We will use the first encoding style via an increasing sequence of positive numbers in what follows.

The easiest cases to classify are the ones that we can visualise, i.e. the convex compact sets in zero- one-, two- and three-dimensional spaces. In dimension zero we have the singleton $\{0\}$ with pattern (), in one-dimensional space there is no freedom: the only fully dimensional convex compact sets are line segments, with the only possible pattern (1). On the plane the two-dimensional possibilities are exhausted by a circle and a triangle, with patterns (2) and $(1, 2)$ respectively (see Fig. 3). Therefore for the two dimensional case we have four possibilities: (), (1), $(1, 2)$ and (2), which coincides with the cardinality of the powerset of two: $2^2 = 4$.

In three dimensions the possibilities for fully dimensional sets are exhausted by the unit ball (3), the tetrahedron (1,2,3), the unit ball intersected with a closed half-space (2,3), and the convex hull of the unit ball and a disjoint point (1,3) (see Fig. 4), so we have in total $2^3 = 8$ possibilities.

We next show that all combinations of facial dimensions are possible in a convex set.



Figure 3: All possible face patterns of fully dimensional sets in two dimensional case are given by a disk and a triangle.



Figure 4: All possible facial patterns for the three dimensional sets

Theorem 1. *For any increasing sequence of positive integers*

$$d = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k)$$

there exists a compact convex set in d_k-dimensional space such that the vector d describes the pattern of facial dimensions for this set.

To prove Theorem 1, we need the following technical lemma, which is surely known, but we were not able to identify it in the literature. We hence provide a short proof here as well.

Lemma 1. *Let $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be nonempty convex compact sets, and let $C = P + Q$. Then every face of C is the Minkowski sum of faces of P and Q. More precisely,*

$$\forall\, F \lhd C \quad \exists F_P \lhd P, F_Q \lhd Q \text{ such that } F = F_P + F_Q.$$

Proof. Let F be a nonempty face of C. We construct two sets

$$F_P := \{x \in P \,|\, \exists y \in Q, x + y \in C\}, \qquad F_Q := \{y \in Q \,|\, \exists x \in P, x + y \in C\}.$$

Both F_P and F_Q are nonempty since F is nonempty.

First we show that $F = F_P + F_Q$. It is obvious that $F \subset F_P + F_Q$, and it remains to show the reverse inclusion. For that, pick an arbitrary $x \in F_P$, $y \in F_Q$. We will next show that $z = x + y \in F$.

By the definition of F_P and F_Q there exist $u \in P$ and $v \in Q$ such that $x + v \in F$ and $y + u \in F$. If $x = u$ or $y = v$, there is nothing to prove, as in this case $z = u + v \in F$. Otherwise, by the convexity of F we have

$$z' = \frac{x + v}{2} + \frac{y + u}{2} \in F.$$

At the same time, notice that $x + y \in P + Q \subset C$; likewise, $u + v \in P + Q \subset C$, and $z' \in (x + y, u + v)$. Since F is a face of C, this yields $z = x + y \in F$.

It remains to show that both F_P and F_Q are faces of Q and P respectively. First note that both are closed compact sets, and that $F_Q \subset Q$ and $F_P \subset P$.

Let $x \in F_P$, and pick any interval $[a, b] \subset P$ such that $x \in (a, b)$. By the definition of C, for an arbitrary $y \in F_Q$ we have $a + y, b + y \in C$. At the same time, $x + y \in F_P + F_Q = F$ and $x + y \in (a + y, b + y)$. From $F \lhd C$ we have $[a + y, b + y] \subset F$, hence, $a + y, b + y \in F$, and therefore $a, b \in F_P$. This shows that F_P is a face of P. The proof for F_Q is identical. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. We use induction in d_k to demonstrate the result. Our induction base is lower dimensional examples discussed earlier. For all increasing sequences of positive numbers $(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ with $d_k \leq 2$ we have found the relevant examples. They are realised by a point, line segment, disk and triangle.

Assume that our assertion is proven for all sequences $(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ with $d_k \leq m$. We will show that the statement is true for $d_k = m+1$. Choose an arbitrary sequence $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_k)$, where $d_k = m + 1$. If $d = (d_k)$, the sequence is realised by the Euclidean unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. If the sequence contains more than one number, consider the truncated sequence $d' = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{k-1})$. Since $d_{k-1} < d_k$, we have $l := d_{k-1} \leq m$, and there exists a compact convex set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ that realises the sequence d' in $l = d_{k-1}$-dimensional space. We embed the set Q in the $m + 1$-dimensional space by letting $Q' := Q \times \{0_{m+1-l}\}$. Observe that since the definition of the face is algebraic, the facial structure of the set Q' is linearly isomorphic to the facial structure of Q (see Fig. 5), and hence Q' has exactly the same facial pattern as Q.



Figure 5: Minkowski sum of a line segment and a unit sphere (on the left hand side), and of a unit square and a sphere (on the right hand side).

Let B be the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. We let

$$C := B + Q'$$

and claim that d is the facial pattern of C.

From Lemma 1 every face of C can be represented as the sum of faces of Q' and B. Since the only faces of B are the set itself and the singletons, then the only possible dimensions of the faces of the set C can come from the sequence $(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$. To show that no facial dimensions are lost, observe that for a unit vector $e = (0, 0, \ldots, 1)$ we have $\{e\} + Q' \subset C$;

on the other hand, the hyperplane $H = \{x \,|\, \langle e, x\rangle = x_{m+1} = 1\}$ supports C, and also $F = H \cap C = Q \times \{0, \ldots, 1\}$ is a face of C linearly isomorphic to Q, and hence the facial structure of F conicides with the facial structure of Q, giving all possible dimensions of faces from the sequence d'. The face of the maximal dimension $m+1$ is given by the set C itself, as it has nonempty interior (take any point from Q' and sum it with an open ball). □

2 Fractal convex sets

The work on fractals and convexity has been done before (see the recent work [6] and references therein), but we are not aware of any references studying the particular problems that we propose here.

In analogy with polyhedral sets, observe that taking the union of faces of a given dimension of a polytope (or polyhedron) results in a set of dimension that coincides with the dimension of the faces. This is clearly not always the case for the general setting: for instance, the dimension of the union of all extreme points of a Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $n-1$, a stark contrast with the polyhedral case.

One of the most interesting cases to study when it comes to dimensions is of course fractal sets. We focus on two examples of convex sets that are generated in a natural way by spherical fractals. One such fractal comes from a recent work [4] by one of our co-authors (curiously from the study of infinite Coxeter groups), another one is constructed via projecting the Sierpinski triangle onto the unit sphere.

We first consider a fractal set on a sphere and then take its convex hull, hence generating a convex set. Our first example is constructed in a similar way to the Apollonian gasket: we take the unit sphere and construct a tetrahedron whose edges touch the sphere (see Fig. 6), then consider the intersection of the sphere with the tetrahedron. After that, we continue



Figure 6: Construction of the spherical gasket.

slicing off spherical caps in such a way that they are tangential to the existing slices (see Fig. 7). The resulting body is a spherical fractal, which is also a convex set. If we now take its convex hull, the extreme points of this convex set would be exactly the points on the fractal set, with remaining proper faces disks that result from the sliced off spherical caps. Notice that this structure is somewhat similar to the compact convex set obtained as the intersection of the cone of symmetric positive semidefinite matrices of dimension 3×3 with a linear subspace defined by matrices with a constant trace

$$C := \mathbb{S}^3_+ \cap \{M \,|\, \mathrm{tr}(M) = 1\}.$$



Figure 7: Apollonian gasket on a sphere and Sierpinski triangles.

This set has dimension 5 however.

This approach can be applied to constructing other spherical fractals. For instance, one can generalise the Sierpinski carpet by cutting out triangular pieces of the sphere in a similar fashion. The convex set obtained after taking the convex hull of this spherical fractal will have no two-dimensional faces, only one-dimensional edges and extreme points.

The Hausdorff dimension of the union of the extreme points is non-integer in both cases, and coincides with the dimension of the relevant two-dimensional objects. It would be interesting to study the conditions that can be imposed on the facial dimensions to define good or regular convex sets.

3 Acknowledgements

The ideas in this paper were motivated by the discussions that took place during a recent MATRIX program in approximation and optimisation held in July 2016. We are grateful to the MATRIX team for the enjoyable and productive research stay.

References

[1] Jean-Baptiste Hiriart-Urruty and Claude Lemaréchal. *Fundamentals of convex analysis*. Grundlehren Text Editions. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Abridged version of Convex analysis and minimization algorithms I and II.

[2] Gábor Pataki. On the connection of facially exposed and nice cones. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 400(1):211–221, 2013.

[3] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.

[4] Tian Sang. *Limit roots for some infinite Coxeter groups*. Master's Thesis, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne, 2014.

[5] Levent Tunçel. *Polyhedral and semidefinite programming methods in combinatorial optimization*, volume 27 of *Fields Institute Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences, Toronto, ON, 2010.

[6] József Vass. On the Exact Convex Hull of IFS Fractals. *arXiv:1502.03788v2*, 2016.

[7] Günter M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*, volume 152 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.